

REMARKS

Claim Summary

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 2-3 and 5; claims 2-3 and 5 are canceled.

Claims 4, 6, and 9 have been amended to update their dependencies.

Claims 13-14 and 16-19 have been amended to maintain strict antecedent basis for the “requesting device” in light of the amendment to base claim 1.

Claim 22 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 23 and 25; claims 23 and claim 25 are canceled. Additionally, claim 22 has been amended to locate the modifying clause “with a user input device” closer to the modified object “communication device”.

Claims 24, 26, and 27 have been amended to update their dependencies and maintain strict antecedent basis.

Claim 36 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 37 and 39; claims 37 and 39 are canceled.

Claim 38 has been amended to update its dependency.

Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 12, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,873,040 (Dunn)

Dunn is directed to a method for “determining location of a wireless mobile unit involved in a call for public emergency assistance (e.g., a “911” call).” Dunn mentions using a calculated (geographic) area and database “to furnish the emergency assistance center handling the call with a detailed mapping of the calculated area, highlighting specific features (terrain, buildings, signs, etc.) that could be used to question the caller in a manner likely to produce responses from which the caller’s location could be either precisely fixed or at least narrowed to a small part of the mapped area.” See Dunn

Abstract. Although Dunn's infrastructure contemplates a map, Dunn's interactions between the rescue personnel and the caller are only verbal and do not show or suggest a map being transmitted to the caller.

Because Dunn does not show "transmitting to the communication device . . . a map of an area that includes the approximate geographic location of the communication device" as recited in claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated by Dunn. Dependent claims 4, 12, 13, and 16 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Claims 2-3 have been canceled. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 12, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dunn.

Rejection of Claims 5-8, 11, 14, 15, 17-26, 31-34, and 36-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,873,040 (Dunn) in view of US 2003/0060211 A1 (Chern)

The Office Action on page 4 states that "Dunn as applied above does not specifically disclose transmitting to a communication device a map of an area that includes a first approximate geographic location of the communication device" and states that Chern remedies the deficiency. The Office Action has also quoted Chern, Page 3, Paragraph 0043, line 9 through Paragraph 0044, line 22 for this limitation.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Dunn and Chern does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claims 22, 33, 36, and 41 as amended. Specifically, independent claims 22, 33, 36, and 41 require "receiving, from the system infrastructure, at least a request for an accurate geographic location of the communication device and a [first] map of an area that includes a [first] approximate geographical location of the communication device" and "receiving, from the user input device, an indication on the [first] map corresponding to [the accurate] geographic location of the communication device" which are not taught or suggested in the combination of Dunn and Chern.

In Chern, the handset provides location information of the handset to the server and the server returns a general location map. But then the rest of the steps of claim 22

about requesting and obtaining more accurate information are missing from Chern. See Chern Paragraph [0043] and Paragraph [0044]. Dunn determines the general location through the infrastructure and requests more accurate information from the user verbally. See Dunn Column 8, lines 14-27. Independent claims 22, 33, 36, and 41, however, require “an indication on the [first] map corresponding to the accurate geographic location of the communication device” instead of the verbal input of Dunn. Neither Dunn nor Chern teaches “receiving, from the system infrastructure, at least a request for an accurate geographic location of the communication device and a [first] map of an area that includes a [first] approximate geographical location of the communication device” and “receiving, from the user input device, an indication on the [first] map corresponding to the accurate geographic location of the communication device” as required by independent claims 22, 33, 36, and 41.

Similar to the discussion above, independent claim 1 is also not unpatentable in view of Dunn and Chern. In Chern, the handset provides location information of the handset to the server and the server returns a general location map. Meanwhile, Dunn’s rescue personnel receives more detailed information from a caller verbally and without receiving an indication on a map. Amended claim 1 recites “receiving from the user input device of the communication device an indication on the map of the more accurate geographic location” which is not shown or suggested by Dunn and Chern. Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable in view of Dunn and Chern. Dependent claims 5-8, 11, 14, 15, and 17-21 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1, and thus are also not obvious in view of Dunn and Chern.

For the above reasons, independent claims 22, 33, 36, and 41 are not obvious in view of the combination of Dunn and Chern. Dependent claims 24, 26, and 31-32 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 22, and thus are also not obvious in view of Dunn and Chern. Dependent claims 22 and 25 are canceled. Dependent claim 34 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 33, and thus is also not obvious in view of Dunn and Chern. Dependent claims 38 and 40 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 36, and thus

are also not obvious in view of Dunn and Chern. Dependent claims 37 and 39 are canceled. Dependent claim 42 depends from, and includes all the limitations of independent claim 41, and thus is not obvious in view of Dunn and Chern. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-8, 11, 14-15, 17-21, 23-26, 31-32, 34, 37-40, and 42 as being unpatentable in view of Dunn and Chern.

Rejection of Claims 9, 10, 27-30, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,873,040 (Dunn) in view of US 2003/0060211 A1 (Chern) and further in view of US 5,699,255 (Ellis)

Dunn and Chern were discussed previously. Ellis proposes transmitting a succession of maps of varying resolutions and details to the navigation device. Ellis does not overcome the deficiencies of Chern and Dunn with reference to claim 1. Namely, none of Dunn, Chern, and Ellis show or suggest “receiving from the user input device of the communication device an indication on the map of the more accurate geographic location” as recited in claim 1. Dependent claims 9 and 10 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1, and thus are also not obvious in view of Dunn, Chern, and Ellis.

As discussed above, independent claim 22 is not unpatentable in view of Dunn and Chern. Ellis also does not overcome the deficiency of Chern and Dunn with respect to claim 22. Namely, none of Dunn, Chern and Ellis show or suggest “receiving, from the system infrastructure, at least a request for an accurate geographic location of the communication device and a first map of an area that includes a first approximate geographical location of the communication device” and “receiving, from the user input device, an indication on the first map corresponding to the accurate geographic location of the communication device” as recited by claim 22. Dependent claims 27-30 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 22, and thus are also not obvious in view of Dunn, Chern, and Ellis.

Independent claim 35 requires “receiving, from the system infrastructure, a request for an accurate geographic location of the communication device and a first map of an area that includes a first approximate geographic location of the communication device” and “receiving, from the user input device, an indication on the first map corresponding to a second approximate geographic location of the communication device, the second approximate geographic location being more accurate than the first approximate geographic location.” As discussed above, the combination of Dunn, Chern, or Ellis does not disclose the cited claim limitations, and thus claim 35 is not obvious in view of Dunn, Chern, and Ellis.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims dependent claims 9, 10, 27-30, and 35 in view of Dunn, Chern, and Ellis.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

By: <u>/Sylvia Chen/</u>	<u>13JUN2007</u>
Sylvia Chen	Date
Attorney for Applicant	
Registration No. 39,633	
Tel. No. (847) 523-1096	
Fax No. (847) 523-2350	
Email: Sylvia.Chen@motorola.com	